App. Ser. No.: 10/645,123 Atty. Dkt. No. ROC920030105US1

PS Ref. No.: 1032.010601 (IBMK30105)

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated April 29, 2010, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on July 29, 2010. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 1-7, 18-21 and 30 are pending in the application. Claims 1-7, 18-21 and 30-36 remain pending following entry of this response. Claims 1-7, 18-21 and 30 have been amended. New claims 31-36 have been added to recite aspects of the invention. Applicants submit that the amendments and new claims do not introduce new matter.

Further, Applicants are not conceding in this application that those amended (or cancelled) claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, as the present claim amendments and cancellations are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of the claimed subject matter. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue these (pre-amended or cancelled claims) and other claims in one or more continuations and/or divisional patent applications.

Statement of Substance of Interview

On July 29, 2010, a telephonic interview was held between Johnny Lam (technical adviser for Applicants) and Examiner Mellissa Chojnacki. During the interview, the parties discussed the cited reference, *Gupta et al.* Claim 1 was discussed. The parties discussed proposed amendments to claim 1. While no agreement was reached regarding the rejection under § 102, the parties agreed that the proposed amendments overcome the objections of record. The proposed amendments are reflected in this response.

1511668 3.DOC Page 7

App. Ser. No.: 10/645,123 Atty. Dkt. No. ROC920030105US1

PS Ref. No.: 1032.010601 (IBMK30105)

Claim Objections

The Office Action states as follows:

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required:

Claim 1, 18, and 30, disclose a "fields and query logic", however, "query logic" is not defined or even mentioned in the specification. Therefore, fails to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. Furthermore, makes the claim language unclear and vague.

Claims 2-6, 19-21 are objected to because they are dependent upon rejected independent claims 1 and 18.

Office Action, p. 2. As stated above, the parties agreed during the interview that the proposed amendments overcome the objections. The proposed amendments are reflected herein. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objections.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-7, 18-21 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by *Gupta et al.*, (U.S. Patent No. 6,956,593, hereinafter "*Gupta*").

With this response, Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite "annotating the selected portion of the query responsive to receiving, via an interface: (i) an annotation for the selected portion of the query and (ii) a request to annotate the selected portion of the query with the annotation." Independent claims 18 and 30 have also been similarly amended. Applicants submit that *Gupta* does not teach "annotating the selected portion of the query responsive to receiving an annotation . . . and a request to annotate the selected portion of the query with the annotation." The claims require that the portion is selected from the query having a plurality of portions. Therefore, as recited in the claim, the selected portion is not the same as the (entire) query. *Gupta* is directed to annotating multimedia content and does not teach selecting the portion of the query as recited in the claim. *Gupta* also does not teach any request to annotate the selected portion of the query with the annotation – or annotating the selected portion of the query

1511668 3.DOC Page 8

App. Ser. No.: 10/645,123 Atty. Dkt. No. ROC920030105US1

PS Ref. No.: 1032.010601 (IBMK30105)

responsive to the request. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Therefore, the claims are believed to be allowable, and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted, and S-signed pursuant to 37 CFR 1.4,

/Gero G. MCCLELLAN, Reg. #44227/

Gero G. McClellan Registration No. 44,227 PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P. 3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500 Houston, TX 77056

Telephone: (713) 623-4844 Facsimile: (713) 623-4846 Attorney for Applicants

1511668 3.DOC Page 9